



Maryland Department of Planning

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Anthony G. Brown
Lt. Governor

Richard Eberhart Hall
Secretary

Matthew J. Power
Deputy Secretary

Memo

To: PFA Work Group members
From: Gerrit Knapp, Derick Berlage and Jon Laria
CC: Stephanie Martins, Joe Tassone, David Whitaker & Jenny King
Date: Friday, May 14, 2009
Re: PFA Work Group Process & Work Plan

Attached is a proposed strategy, schedule and work plan for the Work Group (PFAWG-WPlan514-09). Beyond a few points made below, most of it should be fairly self-explanatory. The first item on the agenda for the May 21 meeting will be to discuss and modify the Work Plan accordingly. Please review it before the meeting.

The primary themes behind the strategy and Work Plan are the following:

1. The Work Plan and Work Group process should be open-minded enough to consider a full range of possible ways to improve PFAs, but circumscribed enough to clearly define the target outcomes and stay on track to get there.
2. Given the potentially large universe of possible ways the WG could spend time and the need to complete the WG charge by November, the process must also be carefully circumscribed to reach useful conclusions and produce useful options and recommendations for the Task Force in that time frame.

To that end, the first page of the attached Work Plan characterizes the process in a few ways:

- General: proposed meeting frequency, duration and interim/ subcommittee meetings
- Synopsis of Work Group Charges : Summary of the 5 PFA WG charges in Jon Laria's March 30 memo to the Task Force
- Preliminary Considerations: Clarifies the relationship between the WG's first charge and charges 2-5; and ID's the importance of agreed-upon objectives against which to assess performance of PFAs to date and consider potential ways to improve them
- Strategy/ Guidelines: Establishes some ground rules per the primary themes (above) to guide the process and keep it on target

The Proposed Agenda and Schedule (pp. 2-3) which follow may seem a bit condensed, but we don't see another way to arrive at the desired destination by November.

Also attached is an integrated work plan for the WG and a Schools Committee (SC). The SC work plan parallels that of the WG, and the two are scheduled to converge at the August 12 meeting of the latter.

WORK PLAN FOR THE PFA WORK GROUP: PROPOSED STRATEGY & SCHEDULE

General

- Monthly regular meetings, 2nd Wednesday each month (except begin May 21)
- Some regular meetings may need to be 3 hours to stay on schedule
- Interim meetings of full WG and/or subcommittees convened as needed to complete each phase of work plan and stay on overall schedule, to degree feasible

Synopsis of PFA Work Group Charge (summarized from Jon's memo)

- 1) Evaluate effectiveness of PFAs as they exist, redefine them & ID alternative approaches that will improve their ability to help achieve SG goals/ objectives
- 2) ID better ways to fund infrastructure & focus public and private investment to achieve SG goals/ objectives in PFAs
- 3) Determine how vertical schools might/ can play an effective role
- 4) See if a different approach to the State capital budget, aka a 6 year CIP for schools, could improve predictability & support for SG goals/ objectives
- 5) Consider how PFA review for school construction might contribute to PFA effectiveness in achieving SG goals/ objectives; broadly consider stakeholder perspectives

Work Plan – Preliminary Considerations

- 1) Charge #1 is the over-arching goal of the Work Group. It should shape the work plan.
- 2) Charges 2-5 are potential implementation mechanisms to achieve Charge #1, the WG's over-arching goal. They should be handled as such.
- 3) To evaluate & redefine PFAs we must decide what we want to achieve, and have some objectives and benchmarks against which we evaluate a) performance of PFAs to date, and b) alternative approaches to improve them.

Strategy/ Guidelines:

- 1) Start with the 12 Visions + other WG favorites (if any, discuss at 1st meeting) as the basis for objectives/ benchmarks against which to assess existing PFAs and alternative approaches.
- 2) Evaluate current PFAs/ performance relative to those Visions/ objectives; take advantage of the evaluations already performed by 3rd parties, WG members, WG organizations.
- 3) Clearly ID the major obstacles to broad realization of Visions/ objectives, and articulate the top challenges that must be met to overcome them (limit to 10 or fewer major challenges)
- 4) Evaluate alternatives (other states' approaches, approaches favored by the WG, & mechanisms named in Charges #2 through 4) against ability to meet the major challenges/ enable broader realization of the Visions/ objectives
- 5) Formulate options and recommendations based on this evaluation to optimize realization of the Visions/ objectives, fulfill WG over-arching Charge.

Proposed Agenda & Schedule (parties with lead or support responsibility for conduct and/or content of agenda items noted in parentheses)

May 21:

- Present/ discuss/ modify/ finalize Work Plan (chairs, J Tassone – all)
 - WG strategy/ process
 - Benchmarks for WG process: Visions, other objectives
 - More specific content for subsequent meetings, especially other completed studies/ info for WG to review on 1) PFA performance to date and 2) potential approaches to consider
- Begin evaluation of PFAs to date (G Knaap, NCSG – all)
 - Overview of selected studies
 - Discussion and conclusion

June 10

- Continue evaluation of PFAs to date
 - Other evaluations/ studies selected on May 13 (WG members & invitees)
 - Conclude evaluation of PFAs to date (G Knaap – all)
- Begin ID of major obstacles/ challenges to broad realization of Visions/ objectives (Chairs – WG members)
 - Obstacles: What are fundamental reasons for shortcomings in performance of PFAs to date?
 - Challenges: What must PFAs do to support realization of Visions/ objectives that they currently fail to do?

July 8

- Conclude ID of obstacles/ challenges
- Begin review and evaluation of approaches/ techniques for their ability to meet challenges/ support broader realization of Visions/ objectives, including funding (Chairs – all; presenters TBD)
 - ID/ discuss approaches/ techniques to examine, evaluate
 - Start with other state's approaches/ techniques

August 12

- Continue review/ evaluation of approaches/ techniques (Chairs – all)
 - Conclude items begun July 8
 - Reports of Schools Committee on vertical schools, 6 year CIP, & PFA review for school construction (Derick Berlage, David Whitaker)
 - Begin review/ evaluation of other approaches/ techniques ID'd previously by WG (Chairs – WG members)

September 9

- Conclude review/ evaluation of other approaches/ techniques (Chairs – all)
- Begin to formulate options based on evaluations (Chairs – all)

- Begin to outline November report (TBD)

October 14

- Continue formulation of options (Chairs – all)
- Begin to draft recommendations (Chairs – all)
- Review report draft outline & content (Chairs – all)

October 28 or November 11

- Finalize options (Chairs – all)
- Finalize recommendations (Chairs – all)
- Discuss revised draft report, incorporation of options and recommendations, finalization (Chairs – all)

PFA Work Group Agenda & Schedule	Public School Committee Agenda & Schedule
<p><u>May 21:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present/ discuss/ modify/ finalize Work Plan (chairs, J Tassone – all) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WG strategy/ process ▪ Benchmarks for WG process: Visions, other objectives ▪ More specific content for subsequent meetings, especially other completed studies/ info for WG to review on 1) PFA performance to date and 2) potential approaches to consider • Begin evaluation of PFAs to date (G Knaap, NCSG – all). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overview of selected studies ▪ Discussion and conclusion 	<p><u>May 4 – May 10:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize Agenda for Schools and PFAs Sub Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete roster for Sub Group ▪ Develop a list of experts and research studies • Review the three charges: Vertical Schools/6-Year CIP/PFAs and schools • Begin mtgs/conference calls to evaluate the 3 charges. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use MDP administrative staff persons to take minutes and notes. ▪ Begin information gathering and use of experts on schools issues ▪ Meetings on two week intervals ▪ Develop a list of experts and studies for review. ▪ Report status to full work group.
<p><u>June 10</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue evaluation of PFAs to date <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Other evaluations/ studies selected on May 13 (WG members & invitees) ▪ Conclude evaluation of PFAs to date (G Knaap – all) • Begin ID of major obstacles/ challenges to broad realization of Visions/ objectives (Chairs – WG members) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Obstacles: What are fundamental reasons for shortcomings in performance of PFAs to date? ▪ Challenges: What must PFAs do to support realization of Visions/ objectives that they currently fail to do? 	<p><u>May 14 – June 5th:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to evaluate the three charges: Vertical Schools/6-Year CIP/PFAs and schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop a summary of the opportunities, challenges & constraints of implementing each of the three recommendations ▪ Evaluate whether/how these tools will meet the objectives of the 12 visions. ▪ What benchmarks should be used to measure effectiveness of the proposed tools? ▪ Evaluate other approaches/ techniques for school funding to achieve SG goals & objectives ▪ Report current status to full PFA Work Group
<p><u>July 8</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclude ID of obstacles/ challenges • Begin review of approaches/ techniques for their ability to meet challenges/ support broader realization of Visions/ objectives, including funding (Chairs – all; presenters TBD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ID/ discuss approaches/ techniques to examine, evaluate ▪ Start with other state's approaches/ techniques 	<p><u>June 15 – July 3:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss/ modify & form a preliminary report on the opportunities, challenges & constraints of implementing recommendations for the three charges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to solicit input on the 3 charges ▪ Refine benchmarks ▪ Develop any additional information to guide decisions ▪ Evaluate other approaches/ techniques ▪ Report current status to full PFA Work Group

PFA Work Group Agenda & Schedule, p. 2	Public School Committee Agenda & Schedule, p. 2
<u>August 12</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue review/ evaluation of approaches/ techniques (Chairs – all) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclude items begun July 8 Reports of Schools Committee on vertical schools, 6 year CIP, & PFA review for school construction (Derick Berlage, David Whitaker) Begin review/ evaluation of other approaches/ techniques ID'd previously by WG (Chairs – WG members) 	<u>July 5 – Aug 7:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliver a report to the PFA Work Group with recommendations and proposed benchmarks on the three charges
<u>September 9</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclude review/ evaluation of other approaches/ techniques (Chairs – all) Begin to formulate options based on evaluations (Chairs – all) Begin to outline November report (TBD) 	<u>August 17 – September 4:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclude review and merge recommendations with approaches & techniques proposed by the full PFA Work Group
<u>October 14</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue formulation of options (Chairs – all) Begin to draft recommendations (Chairs – all) Review report draft outline & content (Chairs – all) 	<u>September 14 – October 2:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue formulation of PFA options
<u>October 28 or November 11</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize options (Chairs – all) Finalize recommendations (Chairs – all) Discuss revised draft report, incorporation of options and recommendations, finalization (Chairs – all) 	<u>October 28 or November 11</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize options and recommendations (Chairs – all)

PFA Workgroup Background Materials

McCarthy, Kevin. 2002. "Smart Growth Initiatives in Other States." Connecticut Office of Legislative Research. Available at: <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2002/olrdata/pd/rpt/2002-R-0986.htm>

- * Old, but good overview of efforts in Georgia, New Jersey, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Rappa, John. 2003. "Designating Areas for State Land Use Policy Planning." Connecticut Office of Legislative Research. Available at: <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2003/rpt/2003-R-0234.htm>

- * Slightly out-of-date, but still a good overview of state approaches.

Florida

Carriker, Roy. 2006. Florida's Growth Management Act: An Introduction and Overview. University of Florida Extension. Available at: <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/FE643>

- * Overview of the growth management tools in Florida.
- * The state designates special areas of concern and exercises review of developments that may impact them. It also reviews projects that meet size thresholds.
- * To see the texts of FL's regulations and laws see:
<http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdcp/dcp/publications/statutesruleslegis/index.cfm>
- * For areas of critical state concern see:
<http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdcp/DCP/acsc/index.cfm> and developments of regional impact:
<http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdcp/DCP/DRIFQD/index.cfm>

Connecticut

Connecticut (State of), Office of Legislative Research. 2005. "Summary for Public Act No. 05-205." Available at: <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2005/SUM/2005SUM00205-R03HB-06570-SUM.htm>

- * The act allows the state to designate priority funding areas that meet a list of criteria and it "generally restricts state funding for growth-related projects to such areas and establishes new criteria for targeting state funding for such projects."

Georgia

Georgia, State of, Department of Community Affairs. N.d. (effective July 1, 2009) Rules of Georgia Department of Community Affairs. Chapter 110-12-4. Regionally Important Resources. Available at:
http://www.dca.state.ga.us/development/planningqualitygrowth/programs/documents/RIR_Rules_000.pdf

- * The state designates "regionally important resources." Local jurisdictions must adopt plans that recognize these resources and allow the state to comment on projects that would impact them otherwise possibly lose funding for (unspecified) state programs.

* Here is a listing of the programs that the department uses to fund smart growth: <http://www.dca.ga.gov/toolkit/FinancialSources.asp> and here is the department's main page on assistance for planning growth: <http://www.dca.state.ga.us/development/PlanningQualityGrowth/programs/assistance.asp>

Maine

Maine, State of. 2000. "Public Laws of Maine. Second Regular Session of the 119th." Available at: <http://janus.state.me.us/legis/ros/LOM/LOM119th/6Pub751-791/6Pub751-791-25.htm>

* State requires towns to designate areas for growth.

* "Growth-related capital investments. The State may make growth-related capital investments only in: A. A locally designated growth area, as identified in a comprehensive plan adopted pursuant to and consistent with the goals and guidelines of this subchapter;"

* Growth-related capital investments are: "Construction or extension of utility lines, development of industrial or business parks, public service infrastructure and public facilities, state office buildings, state courts and other state civic buildings, newly constructed multifamily rental housing."

* See a much more detailed overview at changed in Maine's smart growth laws at: <http://www.state.me.us/spo/boards/communitypreservation/reports/feb03appendixd.pdf>

New Jersey

New Jersey, State of, Department of Community Affairs, Office of Smart Growth. 2008. Plan Endorsement Benefits. Available at: <http://www.nj.gov/dca/divisions/osg/docs/pebenefits.pdf>

* Overview of the benefits municipalities receive from the state for adopting plans that are in compliance with the state plan.

* To view the state plan, see <http://www.nj.gov/dca/osg/plan/> or refer to the Office's website for much more information at: <http://www.nj.gov/dca/divisions/osg/>

Oregon

Oregon, State of. 2009. Oregon Administrative Rules. Division 24. Urban Growth Boundaries. Available at: http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_600/OAR_660/660_024.html

* Requires that local jurisdictions designate urban growth boundaries that can accommodate expected land demands and are consistent with state planning goals.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania, State of, Department of Environmental Protection. N.d. "DEP and Land Use." Available at: <http://www.dep.state.pa.us/hosting/growingsmarter/>

* Summarizes land use planning in PA.

- * Municipalities that coordinate growth plans may be eligible for priority funding from the state. See an overview of this program at:
<http://www.dep.state.pa.us/hosting/growingsmarter/012-0200-004%5B1%5D.pdf>

Tennessee

Tennessee, State of, Intergovernmental Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. N.d. "Public Chapter 1101 in a Nutshell." Available at:
<http://www.state.tn.us/tacir/Portal/Nutshell.htm>

- * Brief summary of state planning mandate and links to complete text.
- * Cities and counties must develop growth boundaries and may designate growth and rural areas. Areas without boundaries are ineligible for state grants.

U.S. Department of Transportation

U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration. 2006. Illinois Tomorrow Corridor Planning Grant Program. Available at:
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Planning/landuse/illinoiscs.htm>

- * Overview of an Illinois state initiative to development to existing transportation.

Washington

Washington, State of. 2009. Revised Code. Chapter 36.70A RCW

Growth management. Available at: <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=36.70A>

- * The state requires urban growth boundaries and reviews them to ensure they comply with state plan goals.

Articles Related to Urban Containment

Arvin, Uri and Michael Bayer. 2003. "Right-sizing Urban Growth Boundaries." Planning, February. <http://www.planning.org/planning/2003/feb/ugb.htm>

- * Contains a number of factors to consider when establishing an urban growth boundary.

Martin, Jonathan and Rolf Pendall. 2002. Holding the Line: Urban Containment in the United States. Brookings Institution. Available at:
http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/reports/2002/08metropolitanpolicy_pendall/pendallfulltoncontainment.pdf

- * Review of containment strategies.

Meck, Stuart. 2002. In Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change. Chicago: American Planning Association. Available online at: <http://www.planning.org/growingsmart/guidebook/index.htm>

- * Excellent guide with numerous model codes.
- * Includes commentary and models on a wide variety of topics.
- * Designed as a policy guide for state legislatures.

Point Systems and Phased Growth

Riehl, Charles T. and Barbara R. Marburger. 2000. Putting Limits on Development. Cleveland, Ohio: Walter & Haverfield, LLP. Available at http://www.walterhav.com/library/docs/20020530124224_406_Law-Limits_Development.pdf.

- * Discusses the legal context for phased growth and rate-of-growth programs.

Hudson (Ohio), City of. 2003. Code of Ordinances. Part 12. Chapter 1211. Growth Management Residential Allocation System. Available at [http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/Ohio/hudson_oh/codifiedordinancesofhudsonohio?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:hudson_oh](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/Ohio/hudson_oh/codifiedordinancesofhudsonohio?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:hudson_oh).

- * Provides a formula for the annual calculation of development permits.
- * Offers priority status for deed-restricted affordable housing, and elderly housing, units for which development was already approved, and 5+ acre units.
- * 80% of all new residential development must be for "priority-status" units.
- * Non-residential development is exempt.

Marathon (Florida), City of. 2002. Rate of Growth Ordinance (ROGO) Information Packet. Available at <http://www.ci.marathon.fl.us/common/modules/documentcenter2/documentview.asp?DID=1594>.

- * Restricts new residential development to 24 units/year (including 5 affordable units).
- * Uses a point system. System is largely focused on environmental impact affordable housing and low density.

Napa (California), County of. Napa County General Plan. Growth Management. Available online at <http://www.napacountygeneralplan.com/library/files/FGPU/Napa%20County%20General%20Plan%2006.03.2008.pdf>.

- * Growth Management Element Starts on pg. 85.
- * 114 new units per year are permitted (based on 2000 Census) until re-calculation; plan explains formula.
- * Certain types of development, including commercial/industrial, are exempted.
- * Different permitted amounts for owner-occupied, small developer, large developer, and "affordable" housing units.
- * See Table AG/LU-D on pg. 91 for review and lottery procedures.
- * Details of lottery system begin on pg. 92.

Santa Barbara (California), County of. 2005. Ordinance no. 3916. Available online at [http://www.sbcountyplanning.org/PDF/forms/LUDC/MGMO_12-2005_\(revised\).pdf](http://www.sbcountyplanning.org/PDF/forms/LUDC/MGMO_12-2005_(revised).pdf).

- * Permits 19 new developments per year, with certain exemptions.
- * Creates a point system based on traffic impact, water usage, bus access, proximity to fire services, etc.
- * Exemptions permitted for certain types of units (e.g. senior) and reuses; affordable housing is listed as "High Priority".
- * Includes guidelines for Hardship exemptions. See <http://www.sbcountyplanning.org/PDF/C/Hardship%20ExemptionSubReqAPP.pdf> for Hardship Exemption Application.

Williston (Vermont), Town of. 2007. Unified Development Bylaw. Chapter 11. Growth Management. Available at http://www.town.williston.vt.us/website/images/documents/ordin/interim_bylaws.pdf.

- * Relevant section begins on pg. 50.
- * Sets a target cap of 80 new dwelling units per year.
- * Most new dwelling units must be within the "Growth Center" and served by existing sewer systems.
- * Point system is based on LEED certification, affordable housing, diversity of housing types, parks, trails, open space, and design.

State Legislation Addressing Annexation and Growth Boundaries

Minnesota, State of. 2007. Minnesota Statutes. Chapter 462. Section 462.352. Definitions. Subdivision 18. Urban growth area. Available at https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/bin/getpub.php?pubtype=STAT_CHAP&year=2007§ion=462#stat.462.352.0.

* Defines urban growth area as "the identified area around an urban area within which there is a sufficient supply of developable land for at least a prospective 20- year period based on demographic forecasts and the time reasonably required to effectively provide municipal services to the identified area."

Minnesota, State of. 2007. Minnesota Statutes. Chapter 462. Section 462.3535. Community-Based Planning. Available at https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/bin/getpub.php?pubtype=STAT_CHAP&year=2007§ion=462#stat.462.3535.0.

* Subdivision 4 requires that local comprehensive plans must address any urban growth areas identified in a county plan, provide for staged delivery of municipal services, and a staged process for boundary adjustments.

* Subdivision 5. (a), (b), and (c) establishes the boundary adjustment process to be followed in annexing territory.

* 5(a) states in part, "After an urban growth area has been identified in a county or city plan, a city shall negotiate, as part of the comprehensive planning process and in coordination with the county, an orderly annexation agreement with the townships containing the affected unincorporated areas located within the identified urban growth area."

Oregon, State of. 2008. Oregon Administrative Rules. Chapter 660. Division 24. Urban Growth Boundaries. Available at http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_600/OAR_660/660_024.html.

* This division covers the process of adopting and amending urban growth boundaries.

* It does not directly address annexation procedures in light of UGBs.

Oregon, State of. 2008. Oregon Administrative Rules. Chapter 660. Division 14. Application of the Statewide Planning Goals to Newly Incorporated Cities, Annexation, and Urban Development on Rural Lands. Available at http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_600/OAR_660/660_014.html.

* Section 660.014.0060 states, "A city annexation made in compliance with a comprehensive plan acknowledged pursuant to ORS 197.251(1) or 197.625 shall be considered

by the commission to have been made in accordance with the goals unless the acknowledged comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances do not control the annexation."

* Section 660.014.0070 lists the conditions that cities must meet to annex lands not subject to an acknowledged comprehensive plan.

Tennessee, State of. 1998. Public Chapter 1101. Available at <http://mtas-notes.ips.utk.edu/public1101.nsf/2f697d8cb9df7c8c8525668700483d8f/47a106e540137ea085256687004936ba?OpenDocument>.

* This is the complete text of Tennessee's growth management legislation passed in 1998.

University of Tennessee Institute for Public Services. 1999. Growth Policy, Annexation, and Incorporation Under Public Chapter 1101 of 1998: A Guide for Community Leaders. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee. Available at http://www.tennessee.gov/tacir/PDF_FILES/Growth_Policy/Annexation98.pdf.

* A guide to help local governments digest and apply Tennessee's growth management laws.

* After a county has passed a growth plan, cities can only annex land outside of their UGBs by referendum or by trial.

Washington Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, State of. 2004. Annexations Under the Growth Management Act: Barriers and Potential Solutions. Available at http://cted.wa.gov/CTED/documents/ID_1494_Publications.pdf.

* In Washington State urban growth areas are set at the county level. In essence the county works with existing jurisdictions to establish urban growth boundaries for future annexations.

* This report is an analysis of why fewer annexations than anticipated were occurring.

Washington, State of. 2008. Revised Code of Washington. Title 35. Chapter 35.13. Annexation of Unincorporated Areas. Available at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=35.13>.

* Section 35.13.005 states that "No city or town located in a county in which urban growth areas have been designated under RCW 36.70A.110 <<http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=36.70A.110>> may annex territory beyond an urban growth area."

Non-Maryland Agreements and Ordinances that Establish Growth Boundaries

Clackamas (Oregon), County of. 1990. Clackamas County – City of Oregon City Urban Growth Management Agreement. Available online at: <http://www.orcity.org/community-develop/planning/documents/UGMA.pdf>.

Jackson (Oregon), County of. 1984. Gold Hill/Jackson County Urban Growth Boundary and Policy Agreement. Available online at: <http://www.co.jackson.or.us/Files/GoldHillUGB.pdf>.

Jackson (Oregon), County of. 1995. Phoenix/Jackson County Urban Growth Boundary and Policy Agreement. Available online at: <http://www.co.jackson.or.us/Files/PhoenixUGB.pdf>.

Wake (North Carolina), County of. 2007. Interlocal Agreement Little River Reservoir Water Supply Watershed Protection. Available online at:
<http://www.wakegov.com/NR/rdonlyres/966694B9-C54A-45B2-B4B6-01ABA499CC90/0/ILAforLittleRiverWaterSupplyWatershedProtectionmax.pdf>.

- * Establishes an urban growth boundary for watershed protection.

Growth Boundary Management Codes

Salem (Oregon), City of. 2007. Salem Revised Codes. Title V. Chapter 66. Urban Growth Management. Available online at:
<http://www.cityofsalem.net/export/departments/slegal/codes/ch66.pdf>.

- * Outlines procedures for boundary amendment.

Silverton (Oregon), City of. 2007. Silverton Municipal Code. Title 18. Chapter 18.195. Urban Growth Boundary and Comprehensive Plan Management. Available online at:
<http://www.codepublishing.com/OR/Silverton/silver18.html#18.195>.

- * Outlines procedures for boundary amendment.

Virginia Beach, City of. 2003. 2003 Comprehensive Plan. Links to policy and technical documents available online at:
<http://www.vbgov.com/vgn.aspx?vgnnextchannel=082454cf18ad9010VgnVCM100000870b640aRCRD&vgnnextparchannel=92d154cf18ad9010VgnVCM100000870b640aRCRD>

* Nearby beach community with development pressures that adopted a growth boundary in 1979. General background at:

http://www.vbgov.com/file_source/dept/planning/Document/policy_ch1.pdf and

http://www.vbgov.com/file_source/dept/planning/Document/tech_background.pdf

* Map of the city, showing the green line dividing growth areas, transition area, and rural areas: http://www.vbgov.com/file_source/dept/planning/Document/comp_plan_map.pdf